



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,738	02/02/2001	Naoya Suzuki	275740US6	8736

22850 7590 07/26/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CONTEE, JOY KIMBERLY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/775,738	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUZUKI, NAOYA	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joy K. Contee	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3-6,13 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 3-6,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alperovich, US Patent No. 6,175,741, previously used.

Regarding claims 3,4 and 5, Alperovich discloses an information processing apparatus and program storage medium (and method of steps) comprising:

receiving means for receiving via a wireless communication link (reads on 205 over the air interface, see Fig. 2) a caller number specific to a caller previously added to an incoming signal arriving at a called station digital cellular telephone set from a caller station cellular telephone set (reads on business card information transmitted through cellular network 10 to a receiving MS, i.e., base

Art Unit: 2617

station is inherent to cellular network 10) via a cellular network communication interface (col. 4,lines 17-65 and col. 5,lines 57-64);

storage means (i.e., reads on business card file) for storing personal information on said caller associated with said caller number (col. 5,line 40-56); and

read and display means for reading said personal information associated with said caller number from said storage means and displaying the personal information (i.e., reads on business card information, e.g., company name, title, fax number and email address) (col. 5,line 64 to col. 6, line 6).

Regarding claims 6,13 and 14, Alperovich discloses a telephone set and program storage medium (and method of steps) comprising:

detecting means (i.e., reads on caller ID service) detecting a caller number which previously added to a transmitted incoming wireless signal via a cellular network communication interface from a base station of public circuit (reads on business card information transmitted through cellular network 10 to a receiving MS, i.e., base station is inherent to cellular network 10) (col. 4,lines 17-65 and col. 5.;lines 57-64);and

transmitting means for transmitting said caller number to an information processing apparatus which reads from a storage means and displays personal information on a caller associated with said caller number (col. 4,lines 17-27) (col. 5,lines 64 to col. 6, line 6).

Art Unit: 2617

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich, U.S. Patent No. 6,175,741, in view of Bayley et al. (Bayley), U.S. Patent No. 6,611,673.

Regarding claim 1, Alperovich discloses an information processing system comprising:

a digital cellular telephone set (i.e., mobile station (MS) 20) including a cellular network communication link, configured to transmit a caller number specific to a caller (i.e., reads on calling party ID and/or calling party number) which is previously added to an incoming wireless signal via the cellular network communication link (reads on business card information transmitted through cellular network 10 to a receiving MS, i.e., base station is inherent to cellular network 10) (col. 4, lines 17-65 and col. 5, line 57 to col. 6, line 6, see Figs. 1 and 3); and

an information processing apparatus (i.e., reads on caller ID interface 276 within the supplementary service application 270) configured to receive said caller number transmitted by said digital cellular telephone set via the wireless communication link, configured to read personal information on said caller

Art Unit: 2617

associated with said caller number from a storage means (i.e., reads on business card file), and configured to display the information (i.e., reads on business card information, e.g., company name, title, fax number and email address) (col. 4, lines 17-65 and col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 6).

Alperovich fails to explicitly teach a digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link.

In a similar field of endeavor, Bayley discloses a digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link (reads on RF transceiver for reading RF tags) and a cellular network communication link (reads on cellular telephone connection) (col. 5, lines 22-67).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alperovich to incorporate other wireless communication links such as an RF transceiver (readers) for the purpose of using RF tag technology in order to automatically access/utilize desired information, e.g., telephone numbers for dialing (see Bayley abstract).

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich and Bayley, in further view of Schuster et al. (Schuster), US 6,584,490.

Regarding claim 15, Alperovich and Bayley disclose the limitations of claim 1, but fail to explicitly disclose wherein the information processing system, wherein said wireless communication link is a BLUETOOTH interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer.

In a similar field of endeavor, Schuster discloses the information processing system, wherein said wireless communication link is a BLUETOOTH interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer (see col. 7, line 5-53).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Alperovich and Bayley to include a wirelink, such as a radio frequency or BLUETOOTH system for the purpose of transferring data to and from a portable information device (PID).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich, in further view of Schuster et al. (Schuster), US 6,584,490.

Regarding claim 16, Alperovich discloses the limitations of claim 14, but fail to explicitly disclose wherein the information processing system, wherein said wireless communication link is a BLUETOOTH interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer.

In a similar field of endeavor, Schuster discloses the information processing system, wherein said wireless communication link is a BLUETOOTH interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer (see col. 7, line 5-53).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Alperovich and Bayley to include a wirelink, such as a radio frequency or BLUETOOTH system for the purpose of transferring data to and from a portable information device (PID).

8. Claims 17-18,19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich and Bayley, in further view of Klausner..

Regarding claims 17-18,19 and 20, Alperovich and Bayley fail to explicitly disclose whereby a summary of said personal information is displayed, and detailed information associated with one or more items in said summary is displayed when said one or more items in said summary is selected.

In a similar field of endeavor, Klausner provides evidence whereby a summary of said personal information is displayed, and detailed information associated with one or more items in said summary is displayed when said one or more items (e.g., fax number or other relevant associated information) in said summary is selected (col. 3,lines 1-5 and lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alperovich to include additional information regarding calling party for display for the purpose providing the subscriber with convenient information.

The combination of Alperovich, Bayley and Klausner fail to explicitly disclose whereby the summary of said personal information is based on an electronic mail database.

However, in a similar field of endeavor Bodnar provides evidence of displaying personal information associated with the Caller Identification information based on a phone book which stores contact information (page 7 [0076]).



Art Unit: 2617

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alperovich, Bayley and Klausner to include a contact phone book for the purpose of combining telephony with personal information management (see Bodnar, page 1 [0007] and page 2 [0011]).

9. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich, in further view of Klausner.

Regarding claims 21-23, Alperovich fails to explicitly disclose whereby a summary of said personal information is displayed, and detailed information associated with one or more items in said summary is displayed when said one or more items in said summary is selected.

In a similar field of endeavor, Klausner provides evidence whereby a summary of said personal information is displayed, and detailed information associated with one or more items in said summary is displayed when said one or more items (e.g., fax number or other relevant associated information) in said summary is selected (col. 3, lines 1-5 and lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alperovich to include additional information regarding calling party for display for the purpose providing the subscriber with convenient information.

Art Unit: 2617

The combination of Alperovich and Klausner fail to explicitly disclose whereby the summary of said personal information is based on an electronic mail database.

However, in a similar field of endeavor Bodnar provides evidence of displaying personal information associated with the Caller Identification information based on a phone book which stores contact information (page 7 [0076]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alperovich and Klausner to include a contact phone book for the purpose of combining telephony with personal information management (see Bodnar, page 1 [0007] and page 2 [0011]).

### ***.Conclusion***


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joy K. Contee whose telephone number is 571.272.7906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571.272.7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JC

  
**JOY K. CONTEE**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**